

## Message Text

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00003 161920Z

44

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-11 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

ACDE-00 AECE-00 DRC-01 EB-11 /164 W

----- 006464

P R 161655Z JUL 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0312

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON 0252

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SEC 3 OF 8 MBFR VIENNA 0167

FROM US REP MBFR

PROPOSING THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ASSUME FROM THE  
OUTSET ONLY AN OBLIGATION TO REDUCE. WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE  
TO ELABORATE AN AGREEMENT OR COMMITMENT IN WHICH ALL  
DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD UNDERTAKE ONLY AN OBLIGATION  
TO REDUCE AT SOME FUTURE TIME? UK REP SAID THE ANSWER  
WAS THAT THIS WAS PART OF WHAT WESTERN REPS WERE SAYING.  
WESTERN REPS WERE SAYING THAT, IN THE FIRST PHASE, US  
AND SOVIETS WOULD BE REDUCED AND THAT, IN THE EVENT OF A  
SATISFACTORY FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, OTHER WESTERN DIRECT  
PARTICIPANTS WOULD GIVE A COMMITMENT TO REDUCE. THE  
END EFFECT OF BOTH SETS OF ACTIONS WOULD BE A COMMITMENT  
BY ALL IN A FIRST PHASE TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES. NETHERLANDS  
REP SAID FURTHER ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION WOULD BE THAT,  
IN CONNECTION WITH A FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, THERE WOULD  
BE AN OBLIGATION FOR ALL TO REDUCE: THE US AND  
SOVIETS IN THE FIRST GROUP OF REDUCTIONS AND THE OTHERS  
SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00003 161920Z

IN A SECOND PHASE. UK REP SAID HE WISHED TO MAKE CLEAR  
THAT PARTICIPANTS WERE NOT SPEAKING NOW ABOUT THE PRECISE  
FORM OF THE COMMITMENT. WHAT WAS NEEDED WAS SOME UNDER-  
STANDING IN PRINCIPLE BEFORE ONE COULD GET TO THE ISSUE OF

FORM. KHESTOV SAID HIS REAL QUESTION WAS WHETHER PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS COULD BE SATISFIED BY A MERE COMMITMENT BY ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO REDUCE SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE. (COMMENT: IT WAS UNCLEAR WHETHER KHESTOV WAS CRITICIZING THIS ASPECT OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL AS INADEQUATE OR DRAWING ATTENTION TO IT AS A POSSIBLE FORM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EAST AND WEST. END COMMENT).

15. GDR REP THEN ASKED WHETHER UK REP'S STATEMENT MEANT THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WERE WILLING TO UNDERTAKE SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS TO BE WORKED OUT IN THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT INCLUDED THE AMOUNT OF FORCES TO BE REDUCED AND THE TIMING OF REDUCTIONS. UK REP HAD MENTIONED THE TIME OF NEGOTIATING THE SECOND PHASE, BUT NOT THE TIMING OF ITS IMPLEMENTATION OR THE PRECISE AMOUNT OF THE REDUCTION WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD UNDERTAKE.

16. UK REP SAID AMOUNTS OF US AND SOVIET REDUCTIONS WOULD BE SPECIFIED IN THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT. AS TO SECOND ASPECT OF GDR REP'S QUESTION, THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT WOULD NOT BE PRECISE ON THE TIMING AND AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS BY WESTERN PARTICIPANTS. THESE WOULD BE NEGOTIATED IN PHASE II. BUT WEST HAD ALREADY GIVEN EAST CERTAIN ASSURANCES ABOUT TIMING WHEN REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD REDUCE. WESTERN REPS HAD SAID TWO THINGS: FIRST, THAT THEY WERE READY TO WORK OUT A TIME TO BEGIN THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. SECOND, THEY HAD TRIED TO MEET THE OTHER EASTERN REQUIREMENT TO KNOW HOW LONG PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS WOULD TAKE AND WHETHER THESE NEGOTIATIONS MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO HAVE A POSITIVE OUTCOME BY SUGGESTING THE INCLUSION IN A PHASE I AGREEMENT OF A PROVISION FOR REVIEW AFTER A SPECIFIED PERIOD. THIS WOULD GIVE AN INDICATION OF THE LIKELY TIME OF DURATION OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. IN THIS WAY, WESTERN REP'S HAD TRIED TO MEET EASTERN QUESTIONS OF THE TIMING OF REDUCTIONS BY REMAINING WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00003 161920Z

17. DRG REP SAID THESE ADDITIONAL REMARKS IN HIS VIEW ONLY CONFIRMED THAT THE ASSESSMENT OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL JUST GIVEN BY THE POLISH REP WAS CORRECT. WHAT THE WEST WAS OFFERING AS A CONCESSION ON MIDDLE GROUND WAS LESS THAN THAT WHICH HAD BEEN AGREED PRIOR TO THE OUTSET OF THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE PRELIMINARY TALKS. THE PRESENT ALLIED FORMULA WOULD NOT EVEN GO THAT FAR. SECOND, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED TO DISCUSS THE ISSUE OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET IN ORDER TO FACILITATE MOVEMENT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT NOT AS A MEANS OF AVOIDING COMPLYING TO THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE ON MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMS AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE

QUESTION OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCTED FROM THE OUTSET  
AS A FRAMEWORK FOR DISCUSSION WAS NOT MEANT TO PREJUDICE  
THE QUESTION OF WHETHER ALL 11 SHOULD PARTICIPATE OR TO  
IMPLY THAT THEY SHOOUJD NOT. PARTICIPATION BY ALL 11  
FROM THE OUTSET WAS WHAT HAD BEEN AGREED IN PRELIMINARY  
TALKS.

18. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT IN THE COMMUNIQUE, DIRECT  
PARTICIPANTS HAD MERELY AGREED TO NEGOTIATE ON MUTUAL REDUC-  
IONS. WITH THE OFFER TO DISCUSS THE ALL- PARTICIPANTS  
FORMULA, ALLIED REPS HAD GIVEN THE EAST THE EAST THE ASSURANCE  
THAT REDUCTIONS WOULD IN FACT BE MUTUAL.  
ALLIES HAD NEVER AGREED OR SAID THAT REDUCTIONS WOULD BE  
MUTUAL FROM THE OUTSET. PARTICIPANTS IN THESE SESSIONS  
WERE CONFRONTED WITH TWO CONFLICTING VIEW. ON THE ONE  
SIDE, THAT ALL SHOULD REDUCE FROM THE OUTSET. ON THE OTHER  
WAS THE FACT THAT ONLY TWO SHOULD REDUCE AND THAT NO FURTHER  
OBLIGATIONS SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN. PARTICIPANTS WERE TRYING  
TO FIND MIDDLE GROUND BETWEEN THESE TWO POINTS. IN THIS  
EFFORT, THEY WERE EXAMINING THE QUESTION OF WHAT WOULD BE THE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic DecapTIONing:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 16 JUL 1974  
**DecapTION Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**DecapTION Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974MBFRV00167  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740790/dcpdmaaf.tel  
**Line Count:** 130  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** ONLY  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** ONLY  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 JUL 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20-Jul-2001 by kellerpr>; APPROVED <13 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> jms 19990818  
**Subject:** MBFR  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO NATO  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005